

SENATE—Saturday, January 20, 1973

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of history, may the taking of vows by the President and the Vice President be a renewal of vows for all. Make this day a new beginning for the Nation when men rise above all petty rivalries, irrelevancies, and trivialities to a new unity of idealism and purpose. Make us a new people born in the spirit from above, given to regeneration of character and to moral renewal, fit for a new age of justice, peace, and righteousness. Work in us and all the people pure religion, an elevated and refined patriotism, and an eagerness to know and to do Thy will, which are the marks of one nation under God.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, attended the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR NUNN ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to proceed beyond

10:45 a.m., with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

Is there morning business?

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS ALLEN AND ERVIN ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the orders for Mr. ALLEN and Mr. ERVIN be reversed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INAUGURATION PROTESTS

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, today Richard M. Nixon will be inaugurated to begin his second term as President of the United States.

Press reports indicate that a sizable protest has been organized to take place at the same time as the inauguration. Estimates of those who will participate range as high as 50,000 persons.

At the same time, two Members of the House of Representatives have stated publicly that a number of Congressmen plan to boycott the inaugural ceremonies. Apparently this action is being taken in protest against the President's Vietnam policies, or in support of the demonstration, or both.

Representative DON EDWARDS of California has been quoted as saying that as many as 165 to 200 Congressmen will refuse to attend the inauguration.

Representative JOHN F. SEIBERLING, of Ohio, was quoted in the January 18 edition of the Washington Star-News as follows:

There's a consensus not to come and bless this man who's got blood on his hands.

That is very strong language, and, I feel, unjustified.

The statement by Congressman SEIBERLING, the expected action of those who are to take part in the demonstration, and the plans for a boycott on the part of some Members of Congress cause me considerable puzzlement.

Why, may I ask, are these actions being taken against the policies of a man who has successfully carried out the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam?

Why are these protests taking place at a time when bombing of North Vietnam has ceased and a peace agreement seems imminent?

It was not President Nixon who made the decision to commit American ground troops to the war in Vietnam. On the

contrary, it was he who has withdrawn the troops.

When he took office, President Nixon was faced with a situation in which the United States was deeply committed in a ground war. There were 549,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam at that time.

Today 96 percent of those troops have been withdrawn. No American combat troops are on the line in Vietnam.

Furthermore, President Nixon has pressed hard for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. It now appears that an agreement may be signed in the near future.

It is my feeling that the protests being carried out today are taking place at the wrong time and are being directed against the wrong man.

If many Americans differ with the President as to the policies he has followed in Vietnam, that is understandable. It is the unquestionable right of such persons to give voice to their opposition.

However, I question the fairness and the judgment of those who would demonstrate against the inauguration today.

It is my profound hope that we shall have a cease-fire in Vietnam next week.

And it is my opinion that those who are carrying out demonstrations against the inaugural are doing nothing to bring peace 1 hour sooner.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENEROUS GIFT OF LAND BY UNION CAMP CORP. TO THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, on last Wednesday the Union Camp Corp. announced that it was donating to the Nature Conservancy over the next 3 years its Virginia landholdings in the Great Dismal Swamp of nearly 50,000 acres.

Accounts of this most generous gift appeared on the front page of last Thursday's edition of the Washington Post. I might add that Mr. James Free, the astute Washington reporter for Alabama's largest newspaper, the Birmingham News, must be psychic; for in the Tuesday, January 16, issue of the News, there appeared an article by Mr. Free about the Great Dismal Swamp and efforts being made to preserve and protect this natural and remarkable phenomenon.

I commend the Union Camp Corp. for this magnificent gift of lands. The company has plants in my home State of Alabama and contributes to the economy and well-being of Alabama in so many ways.

This donation, I should point out, phil-

osophically ties right in with the bill I am cosponsoring with the senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), and the senior Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) to establish a "wild areas" system whereby access to and opportunity for recreational, scenic, conservational, and historical uses of large land areas that are essentially undisturbed may be available to persons residing in the Eastern and Southeastern United States. Like the areas described in our bill (S. 22), much of the lands in the Great Dismal Swamp have been logged or otherwise disturbed and, therefore, they do not meet the strict standards of the Wilderness Act of 1964 although the lands have either been restored or are relatively undisturbed.

I want again to commend the Union Camp Corp. for its generous donation, and I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the article which appeared in the January 18 issue of the Washington Post about the donation, the article by Mr. Free which appeared in the January 16 issue of the Birmingham News, and a copy of the release by the Union Camp Corp. announcing the donation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1973]

HEART OF DISMAL SWAMP NOW REFUGE
(By Hank Burchard)

The heart of Great Dismal Swamp—77 square miles of America's last great Eastern wilderness—has been saved for a national wildlife refuge, The Nature Conservancy announced yesterday.

The land, located in Virginia near the North Carolina border and representing perhaps a fourth of the dwindling swamp, will be deeded over the conservancy by its owner, Union Camp Corp. of Wayne, N.J., which produces timber and manufactures paper bags and cartons. The land is appraised at \$12.6 million.

The gift includes all of Lake Drummond, whose wine-colored waters are considered the key to the survival of the long-threatened swamp. Loggers and farmers have been draining the swamp for so many years to "improve" the land that the lake level has fallen to six feet, half of what it once was.

Great Dismal, which George Washington surveyed, once spread for more than 1,000 acres along the eastern Virginia-North Carolina border. It now measures less than half that by the loosest of definitions. "What remains that still has the character of a true swamp isn't much more than about 300 acres," a conservancy spokesman said.

The conservancy, a private, non-profit foundation dedicated to preserving ecologically valuable land, has saved some 400,000 acres of land nationwide by getting in ahead of developers and buying key parcels. It is negotiating with other Great Dismal owners in hope of increasing the present acreage.

Union Camp will deed its 49,000 acres over in stages during the next three years. The federal law allows the company tax deductions of 50 cents per dollar of appraised value, or a total of \$6.3 million.

The conservancy in turn will deed the land to the Interior Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which will administer the refuge. The first parcel will be transferred in February, probably on George Washington's birthday. Washington was one of the earliest developers of the swamp.

Although the deeds will make the federal government owner in perpetuity of the land,

it contains a reverter clause that would void the transfer if the government failed to protect and preserve the swamp.

The clause is important because, according to most of the conservationists who have been fighting to save the swamp for many years, the government has been one of the chief villains in the destruction of Great Dismal.

"The federal government, by way of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, has absolute control of the water rights of Lake Drummond, but for years and years they have done nothing to stop the ditching that is draining away much of the ground water that feeds the lake," said Alvah Duke, chairman of the Dismal Swamp committee of the Wilderness Society of Virginia.

"We are expecting more careful control of lake drainage from now on," a conservancy spokesman said yesterday. "We are told that the Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department are drawing up new ground rules for water management in the swamp."

One of the greatest strains on the 3,000-acre lake is the Dismal Swamp Canal, which is part of the Intercoastal Waterway and is operated by the engineers.

"Every time a boat—workboat, pleasure boat or canoe—goes through the canal the opening of the locks drain away 3 million gallons of water from Lake Drummond. Three million gallons of some of the finest and most famous fresh water in the world," said William E. Ashley of Portsmouth.

The corps long has favored abandonment of the canal, which has been superseded by the wider, deeper and shorter Chesapeake & Albemarle Canal.

George Washington helped dig what is known as Washington's ditch through which he hoped to drain the swamp and use it for farmland.

During most of its history Great Dismal has been regarded with much the same attitude as that expressed by Col. William Byrd II, who surveyed the state line through it in 1728.

He called it a "horrible desert (sic) . . . nor indeed do any birds care to fly over it . . . for fear of the noisome exhalations that rise from this vast body of dirt and nastiness."

But Brooke Manley, a biologist at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, told Union Camp some 75 species of birds are known to nest in the swamp, and many more winter in it or use it as a way station during their migrations.

Great Dismal is the northernmost of the chain of great swamps that begins with the Everglades, but it is unique because it lies well above sea level, which is why it has been so vulnerable to drainage: the swamp drains out rather than in.

It is a geological freak, and no consensus has been reached on how it originated.

The deep peat beds through which the ground water filters into the lake give it a color which, in a glass, looks very like rain-water Madeira wine. It is sweet and supposed to be so resistant to going foul that sailing ships used to carry casks of it.

While the animal population has shrunk along with the margins of the swamp, it still is home to the bear, deer, raccoon, snapping turtle, bobcat, river otter, marsh rabbit, cotton mouse and cotton mink, muskrat, flying squirrel, silver-haired bat, cottontail and nutria, with other species reported but unconfirmed. And it has its own unique species: the Dismal Swamp short-tailed shrew.

Union Camp's 77 square miles have not been logged since before World War II. "A refuge is the right thing for this land, the only right thing," Union Camp president Samuel M. Kinney Jr. said yesterday.

"I hope the conservancy can get the other companies to cough up the rest of it."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 16, 1973]

SAVE "THE GREAT DISMAL SWAMP"?

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON.—This is as good a day as any to write about "The Great Dismal Swamp."

The sky is overcast, and the air is a bit dank and drippy. If the day isn't dismal, it's the next worst thing. Residents of the Washington Area, temporary and permanent, are still in the dumps because their "Redskins" outplayed the Miami "Dolphins" in only the second half of professional football's Super Bowl—and lost.

Some of the Redskin fans also were University of Alabama fans, who on New Year's Day saw the "Crimson Tide" outplay the University of Texas in only the first half of the televised Cotton Bowl game—and lose.

If only the Redskins could have had Alabama's first half, with vice versa in the second half, both their worlds would be brighter.

But back to the Great Dismal Swamp for a message of encouragement. We've driven around its fringes several times over the years, and one rainy day last summer we took a \$3 boat ride on "Feeder Ditch" to Lake Drummond, which is the heart of the Great Dismal.

It's "great" all right, and could remain so with a little help from the United States Government and the states of Virginia and North Carolina. Most of the several hundred thousand acres involved are in Virginia.

NO LONGER "DISMAL"

So much timber has been cut in the swamp (since George Washington in 1765 organized the first company to build a canal into it and exploit the vast stands of virgin cypress and juniper) that it isn't very dismal any more.

Early in this century many miles of narrow gauge railroad were built throughout the Great Dismal. And until a few years ago a substantial industry of lumber and cedar shingle production flourished on its borders.

While a reforestation program is well under way, it will be some years before a sizable new growth can cover much of the area. And, of course, the original scale and grandeur can never be recaptured.

IS THIS A SWAMP?

There is even some argument as to whether the place is really a swamp in the traditional meaning of the word.

Are not swamps lower than the land around them?

Much of the Great Dismal's fringe areas are lower than the roads that traverse them. This is true of U.S. Highway 17, from which the greatest number of persons have seen a section of the swamp.

Yet when one goes by boat up "Feeder Ditch" from U.S. 17 to Lake Drummond, some three miles distance, the journey is upstream, against the slow current.

Lake Drummond, as visitors constantly seem amazed to learn, is nearly 20 feet above sea level. And the water from Lake Drummond makes possible the navigable depth of the Dismal Swamp canal on the eastern side of the swamp.

What George Washington's company dug is not a canal, in the modern sense, though logs and-or timber were barged out in the early years through what has long been called the "Washington Ditch." This ditch drains out of Lake Drummond's northeast rim.

A considerable part of the Great Dismal is dry land. So what kind of a swamp is that? Whatever it is, Members of Congress from Virginia and some from North Carolina think it is worth preserving. They are sponsoring bills authorizing the Interior Department to acquire the "swamp," perhaps as much as 350,000 acres, from its several owners and

companies. It would be administered as a national monument.

As Rep. William Whitehurst, R.-Va., says: "The ecology of the Dismal is unique."

"It is a boundary region," Whitehurst continues, "the farthest north or south many plants and animals are found. It is on the Eastern flyway and has over 80 species of birds. Rare fish and animals are found there. It is essentially a peat bog, containing the only peat fields still forming on the North American continent."

"The Dismal Swamp is the last large land area on the East Coast that remains undeveloped and in a fairly primitive, natural condition."

So, surely there is hope and a brighter future when, plainly, things are not as bad as they sound—when the Dismal really isn't dismal and the swamp may not even be a swamp.

And 1973 brings a new season with new opportunities for every one to put two good halves together.

UNION CAMP CORP. ANNOUNCES \$12.6 MILLION LAND GIFT TO THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

WAYNE, N.J., January 17, 1973.—Nearly 50,000 acres of one of the most unique and significant wild areas remaining on the Eastern Seaboard will be preserved as a natural wilderness through action to be taken by Union Camp Corporation, a major forest products firm headquartered in Wayne, New Jersey. The company will donate its entire landholdings in Virginia's Dismal Swamp, with an appraised value of \$12.6 million, to The Nature Conservancy, the nation's leading non-profit, land conservation organization.

Everett M. Woodman, president of The Nature Conservancy, said, "The Union Camp Corporation gift is the largest and most significant land gift the Conservancy has received in its two-decade history of private land conservation." Dr. Woodman indicated that present plans call for the Dismal Swamp land to be conveyed to the United States Department of the Interior for operation as a national wildlife refuge by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The Union Camp land lies just ten miles southwest of Norfolk, the center of the fast-growing Hampton Roads area which has a population of more than one million.

In commenting on this action, the Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, said, "I am delighted with the plans of Union Camp Corporation and The Nature Conservancy to convey this property to the Department of the Interior. The Department has long been interested in the preservation of the Great Dismal Swamp. In fact, in July of this past year, my Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments recommended that this property be registered as a Natural Landmark. We are particularly pleased that Union Camp has so appropriately recognized the high responsibility to the Nation that goes with the ownership and use of a property which has outstanding value in illustrating the natural history of the United States."

A formal donation ceremony, involving Secretary Morton and Union Camp and Conservancy officials, is planned for next month in Washington.

The Great Dismal Swamp, which has been called one of the East's last wildernesses and a unique ecosystem, has figured in history and legend since pre-colonial times. George Washington and Patrick Henry once owned portions of it. Thomas Moore, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote about it. The Union Camp donation includes Lake Drummond, a nearly circular lake covering about 3,000 acres and with an average maximum depth of 6 feet. According to Nansemond Indian legend, the depression

was created centuries ago by the "Fire Bird"—possibly a meteor.

Commenting further on today's announcement, Dr. Woodman said, "This gift by Union Camp, the major landowner in the entire Dismal Swamp, marks the first of what we at the Conservancy hope will be a continuing program to preserve significant areas of the Dismal." Woodman pointed out that many others with holdings in the swamp could follow Union Camp's lead to preserve it, which has been a goal of both local and national conservation groups for almost a decade.

In making the announcement, Union Camp Chairman Alexander Calder, Jr., said, "The Dismal Swamp is a natural wilderness and we're pleased that the company's gift will help to protect and preserve it in its natural state. Our goal is to apply each of our landholdings to highest possible end-use. The historic significance of our Dismal Swamp acreage and its proximity to a rapidly-growing major population center make it a vital asset to be retained for enjoyment and use by present and future citizens while providing an important addition to the national wildlife refuge system."

Samuel M. Kinney, Jr., president of Union Camp, added: "The nation's tax laws, quite properly, encourage this type of action by individuals and corporations. These laws make it possible for Union Camp to donate one of its assets—in this case a beautiful, natural resource—and in exchange receive the benefit of a deduction of its appraised value from taxable earnings over a period of several years. This benefits everyone: future generations of Americans as well as Union Camp Corporation and its shareholders."

The Conservancy's national operations director, Patrick F. Noonan, called the Union Camp donation "a breakthrough and clear evidence adding to the growing testimony of the positive role that industry can play in the preservation of vast areas of natural land."

Initially, Union Camp will donate an "undivided interest" of 40 percent of its Dismal Swamp holdings. It will add to this percentage over the next three years with the complete transfer taking place in 1975, in time for the following year's National Bicentennial Celebration.

Today's Dismal Swamp is less than a third of its original size. This shrinkage has been principally because of residential and agricultural development.

The present swamp is astride the state line, with 40 percent in Virginia and 60 percent in North Carolina. The land involved in the Union Camp donation represents about one-half the swamp's acreage in Virginia. It also includes the Washington Ditch, probably the earliest "monument" to bear the name of the Father of our Country. George Washington and his associates dug the ditch in 1763 to drain the land in the swamp for agricultural purposes.

Union Camp, which owns almost 1.7 million acres in six southeastern states, came into ownership of its Dismal Swamp property when Camp Manufacturing Company, one of its predecessor companies, acquired it in 1909.

For the past quarter of a century Union Camp has carried on no significant timber harvesting operations there but has continued to scientifically manage the property, foster the natural regeneration of its trees, encourage scientific and educational studies, conduct tours, and make major portions available to local hunt clubs to maintain the deer herd at a number which the land would support.

The Great Dismal Swamp is not an ordinary swamp. It is a vast wildland of forest and bog which only in a few areas is "swampy" in the way that is associated with other, more typical swamps in the country. It contains forms of plant and wildlife which are

rarely seen elsewhere. For many species it is the northernmost "station"; that is, the farthest north the southern species extend. The Dismal Swamp shrew is indigenous to the swamp.

The Nature Conservancy is the only national conservation organization, receiving its support from the public, whose resources are solely devoted to the preservation of land. To date the Conservancy and its members have succeeded in helping to preserve some 365,000 acres involving more than 850 projects in 45 states and the Virgin Islands. These include forests, swamps, marshes, prairies, mountains, and beaches.

Headquarters for the Conservancy are located in metropolitan Washington, D.C., with regional offices in Atlanta, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Arlington, Virginia.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce a resolution which will set aside the fourth Saturday of each September as the day the public recognizes the meritorious and deserving outdoor sportsmen of America for their truly remarkable record in environmental protection and enhancement, fish and wildlife preservation and propagation, and in gun and boat safety promotion and instruction.

Any doubt that a so-designated National Hunting and Fishing Day is less than significant and justified was erased by the overwhelming public response to the first such day on September 23, 1972.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to introduce the first National Hunting and Fishing Day resolution a year ago, and my proud pleasure to see it adopted unanimously in this body, just as it was adopted without a dissenting vote when Representative SIKES introduced it in the House.

As originally introduced, the resolution called for the observance of National Hunting and Fishing Day on the fourth Saturday of each September, permanently establishing the occasion on such succeeding calendar.

Final congressional action, however, called for a single observance in 1972, and when President Nixon officially proclaimed National Hunting and Fishing Day it was so designated.

Now, as I reintroduce the resolution to

make it an annual event, I would like to review for my colleagues some of the evidence of the tremendous response the first NHF Day produced, and to take this occasion to commend the National Shooting Sports Foundation for spearheading the drive to make it the success it was.

Led by the Shooting Sports Foundation, with a substantial assist from the National Wildlife Federation, the National Rifle Association, and the National Sporting Goods Association, NHF Day 1972 enlisted the active support of no less than 40 national organizations, some of whom were represented on the NHF Day steering committee.

The National Shooting Sports Foundation alone distributed 325,000 NHF Day brochures, 4 million stickers, 3,910 manuals, 65,200 public service radio messages, thousands of news releases about the event—NHF Day material appeared in 2,500 newspapers—and sent personal letters to every Governor, Fish and Game Commissioner, and cooperating organization.

The results of the ensuing promotional and educational effort were truly astonishing, Mr. President.

In short order, all 50 State Governors proclaimed NHF Day or issued formal statements of support. Their lead was followed by more than 500 mayors or city managers from New York City to Siloam Springs, Ark.

Mr. President, the major purpose of National Hunting and Fishing Day was to give the Nation's 55 million outdoor sportsmen their greatest opportunity in modern times to present themselves to the public as practicing conservationists.

They availed themselves of that opportunity, staging open houses, demonstrations, displays, and exhibits the length and breadth of the Nation.

It is estimated that more than 6,000 sportsmen's clubs participated in more than 2,500 such events.

Reported public attendance ranged from 50,000 at a multiclub 5-day observance on Long Island, to nearly 25,000 at the Wyandotte Fair Grounds near Kansas City—where 11 clubs took part—down to a hundred or 200 people visiting sports club open houses in small towns.

Though all reports are not in, and may never be complete, because of the difficulty in judging attendance at those open houses conducted in such places as major stores, parking lots, and military bases, the NHF Day steering committee feels certain that no less than 4 million Americans turned out to view exhibits by sportsmen's clubs, national and local conservation organizations, State fish and game departments, Boy Scouts and civic clubs involved in conservation projects.

At a shopping mall in Florida, an old farm in Connecticut, a taxidermy shop in Washington State, and in a convention motel in my own State of New Hampshire, for example, people learned how sportsmen not only hunt and fish, but also how they contribute more than \$250 million a year to the cause of conservation.

More than anything else, Mr. President, that first National Hunting and

Fishing Day contributed immeasurably to broadening understanding between Nation's outdoor sportsmen and the general public, demonstrating that sportsmen and nonsportsmen do, indeed, have a mutual interest in preserving, protecting, and enhancing natural resources, natural beauty, wildlife and the total environment, and giving convincing evidence that the two groups can—and must—work in harmony to achieve these goals.

Mr. President, because the first National Hunting and Fishing Day was so successful, because it was so encouraging, because future such occasions hold such promise, I am today reintroducing the resolution designating the fourth Saturday of September as National Hunting and Fishing Day and making this event an annual observance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 200

At the request of Mr. McINTYRE, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHWAY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) were added as cosponsors of S. 200, a bill to require that new forms and reports, and revisions of existing forms, resulting from legislation be contained in reports of committees reporting the legislation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

At the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 10, the school prayer amendment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 23—REPORTING OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 23

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1973, through February 28, 1974, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$212,000, of which amount not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1974.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AMERICANS REMEMBER THE 148TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF STONEWALL JACKSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during this busy inaugural weekend for the 37th President of the United States, I remind my Senators and our citizens generally that tomorrow marks the commemoration of the 148th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious sons of West Virginia and of our country. On January 21, 1824, Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson was born in the western region of Virginia, in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.

He lived as a boy and young man in what is now Lewis County, in the Mountain State. Stonewall Jackson was 18 years old when he became a constable of Lewis County. Following the death of his parents, who died in poverty, Stonewall was reared by his uncle for 12 years before entering West Point in 1842.

Jackson was a born fighter. In his youth he fought poverty. He fought for an education at West Point. There he struggled against prejudice and disadvantage. Jackson learned what he set out to learn by sheer effort. What interested him he understood. He was a man with a soul of fire. Action was his life.

A Democrat and the owner of a few slaves, most of whom he bought at their own request, he deplored the prospect of war, which he described as the "sum of all evils."

Yet in the dreadful War Between the States, Jackson achieved true greatness as one of the outstanding American military geniuses. History has recorded well the accomplishments of this Civil War general on the battlefield. Much has been

written on Stonewall Jackson's numerous military feats, particularly on his unique conduct of the famous valley campaign, the successful military maneuvers, the leadership, his strong character, Jackson's 16,000 troops against the 62,000 Federal soldiers.

On June 17, 1861, at Harper's Ferry, in Jefferson County, W. Va., which is now a national historical park attracting over a million visitors annually, Jackson was made brigadier general and, having brought his command to high efficiency, he moved it with the rest of Gen. Joseph Johnston's army, to the battlefield of Bull Run, where it sustained the Federal onslaught at a crucial hour. "There is Jackson standing like a stone wall," cried Brig. Gen. Barnard Bee, as his own troops retreated. This incident gave Jackson the name, "Stonewall," better known around the world than the Christian name given at birth.

General Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the early age of 39. His short but successful life ended sadly as a result of wounds inflicted by his own soldiers through an unaccountable mistake during the Battle of Chancellorsville. We can only envision the role General Jackson might have provided in West Virginia's early formative years. West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863, approximately 1 month after General Jackson's death.

It is testimony to the measure of the man, Stonewall Jackson, that both the sovereign States of Virginia and West Virginia claim him as a son. West Virginians, indeed, take justifiable pride in the landmarks that illustrate a part of his life. In Clarksburg a bronze plaque appears at the location of his birthplace, 324-328 West Main Street. The cemetery there in Jackson Park bears the physical remains of Stonewall Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father, and his sister, Elizabeth.

On the original 5 acres of Stonewall Jackson's boyhood home, which was destroyed by fire, is located the combination grist and sawmill, completed in 1937, which was listed February 23, 1972, on the national register of historic places by the National Park Service. His grandfather built his first mill on the West Fork River before 1800. In 1921, West Virginia acquired the historic mill and 5 acres for the beginning of the first State 4-H camp in the Nation. Now totaling 525 acres, the camp is operated as an off-campus educational facility. Jackson's Mill is known nationwide for its rustic beauty and excellent accommodations. Jackson's Mill is located north of Weston, Lewis County.

Mr. President, in the civic-minded city of Clarksburg, where an impressive equestrian statue of Jackson is located on the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse, directly across the street from the Stonewall Jackson Hotel, the anniversary of the birth of Stonewall Jackson continues to be commemorated, and appropriately so, by historical and service organizations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Clarksburg Exponent of

January 18, 1970, on that year's ceremony.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JACKSON WAS BORN HERE 148 YEARS AGO

Sunday, Jan. 21, will mark the 148th anniversary of the birth of General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson. He was born in Clarksburg Jan. 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, announced that two local organizations are honoring the historic occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy will place a wreath on the bronze plaque erected on the birthplace site in the 300 block of West Main Street in downtown Clarksburg. Mrs. E. B. Dakan, Jr. is president of the local U.D.C.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club will remember the renowned general by placing a wreath on the equestrian statue on the plaza of the Harrison County Court House. Mrs. Fray G. Queen, Jr. heads the civic organization.

The Clarksburg Chapter of the U.D.C. erected the bronze plaque in August, 1911, to commemorate the General's birthplace.

On Sunday, May 10, 1953, the famous bronze equestrian statue was dedicated. This was made by the late Charles Keck, widely known sculptor of New York City. His widow attended the unveiling and impressive dedicatory ceremonies. The base of the statue was designed by William Grant, a Clarksburg architect.

The equestrian statue is a three-quarter life-size bronze original model casting for the Stonewall statue at Charlottesville, Va., dedicated Oct. 19, 1921.

Stonewall Jackson is enshrined in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. A striking statue by Moses Ezekiel of Richmond, Va., a graduate of Virginia Military Institute of Lexington, Va. and a personal friend of General and Mrs. Robert E. Lee, was dedicated at Charleston, W. Va. on Sept. 27, 1910. A similar statue was erected two years later on the grounds of V.M.I. and dedicated June 19, 1912.

Following the election of General Jackson in 1955 to the Hall of Fame, Bryant Baker, the sculptor, was commissioned to prepare the bronze bust, and this is in effect the model from which Mr. Baker made the bust later placed in the Capitol Building in Charleston, W. Va. and dedicated Sept. 13, 1959.

At V.M.I. Stonewall Jackson was professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, and Instructor of Artillery Tactics for 10 years, from 1851 to 1861. Then he was called upon to enter that career of distinction which in two years made the name of Stonewall Jackson immortal.

Between April 29, 1861 and May 1, 1863, Stonewall Jackson distinguished himself as one of the greatest military strategists that ever lived.

General Jackson was a master of the art of war. He used his two great elements, initiative and surprise, in unsurpassed applications.

Swift and sure of attack, dogged and determined in defense, undismayed by adverse odds, he was the ideal battlefield commander.

One of the finest tributes to Stonewall Jackson was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur, at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" by Sculptor Bryant Baker in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, May 19, 1957.

In his telegram General MacArthur stated: "Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian,

Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southeast Pacific area of World War II. 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.'"

Two of Jackson's favorite maxims were "You May Be Whatever You Resolve To Be" and "Never Take Counsel of Your Fears."

Stonewall Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan and Stonewall's sister, Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery in Jackson Park, located on East Pike Street, Clarksburg.

The General's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister Laura lies at rest in Buckhannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall's wife, Mary Anna Morrison, died at Charlotte, N.C., March 24, 1915.

Jackson died May 10, 1863 at the age of 39 near Guinea Station, Va. and is buried in Lexington, Va.

PHASE III

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on Sunday, January 14, 1973, the Washington Post published an article by Arnold Weber, formerly with the Pay Board, regarding phase III. The article provides some thoughtful perspective on the controls program to date and the outlook for phase III.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks so that other Members of the Senate and members of the public who have not had a chance to see this article can review it.

We are about to take up the question of the proposed extension of the Economic Stabilization Act in the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and literature on the controls program needs to be circulated and discussed during the coming weeks if the Senate is to evaluate and act on this proposal in an informed manner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WEBER ON PHASE III: "FREE-FORM SCENARIO" (By Arnold R. Weber)

If the Wage-Price Freeze of 1971 descended on the economy like an avalanche, Phase III signals the initiation of a thaw in the expectation that it is more likely to enrich than to engulf the economy.

The new program has been unveiled against a background of considerable achievement. The Cost of Living Council hasn't enjoyed the same success as the Miami Dolphins but it ranks with the Pittsburgh Steelers as one of the surprises of the season. The system survived several shocks at the outset including the departure from the Pay Board of four labor members. Price increases have subsided while real earnings have increased measurably. Most significantly, the program has been implemented without dampening the powerful economic recovery that took place throughout 1972. Though orthodox economists may attribute these improvements to the invisible hand, some credit must be given to bureaucratic prestidigitation.

This record will be difficult to sustain in 1973. The continued economic expansion will exert pressure on resources and prices. Most of the heavy hitters in organized labor are scheduled to bat in a new round of collective bargaining. Under a system of controls each major settlement acquires a special visibility so that a generous wage settlement that is an

economist's aberration may become a union leader's standard of performance. If the Pay Board's most difficult task in 1972 was to get the "last cows" in the barn, the major tactical issue of 1973 will be to separate the "golden goat" from the herd.

These difficulties will be augmented by the special problem of food prices. Since the beginning of Phase II, food prices at the retail level have risen at an annual rate of 4.7%. Although they have been subject to only limited controls, food prices are a key element in the public's perception of the effectiveness and fairness of the program. Realistically, the stabilization program cannot be expected to control the price of peanut butter in Keokuk, Iowa; but to the housewife in Keokuk this price is a more meaningful barometer of economic stability than a rollback ordered by the Price Commission. The recent upsurge in wholesale prices does not indicate that unfettered supply and demand will relieve this pressure.

Beyond these considerations the program probably will be faced with an erosion of public support. Until now the public's enthusiasm for controls has confounded libertarians who place these restraints in the same category as the drunken uncle at the family picnic. Nonetheless, frustration with bureaucratic delays and the impossibility of achieving perfect equity inevitably diminish public support. As experience has indicated most decisions made by the controllers have earned one ingrate and two enemies.

The design of Phase III represents a complex effort to deal with these problems. Ignoring differences in trim and upholstery, the new model can be analyzed in terms of three broad issues: coverage, the nature of the program goals, and organizational structure.

The issue of coverage is the least dramatic but most crucial to the redefinition of the stabilization program. During Phase II the controls probably have been too comprehensive for the task at hand. If controls were intended to mitigate the exercise of economic power, then coverage should have focused on those sectors where power was most manifest. Because of a concern over inflationary expectations, however, Phase II reached into virtually every corner of the economy. Some reduction in coverage was desirable, but the projections of a boom in 1973 created pressures to retain a wide perimeter for the stabilization program. The policy makers were thus confronted with the delicate task of reducing effective coverage while preserving the capability for dealing with broader pressures on wages and prices.

Phase III attempts to dance out of this corner with a nimble four-step. First, most sectors of the economy will still be subject to the legal fact of controls. However, the applicable wage and price regulations will be "self-administered" and the resultant behavior scrutinized by the IRS. Agricultural products continue to be exempt, a risk that will have to be vindicated by measures other than controls.

Second, the Cost of Living Council will keep a tight rein on large economic units—with more than \$50 million in sales and 1,000 employees—through special reporting and record keeping requirements.

Third, mandatory controls are still applicable to three industries where inflation is likely to flicker: construction health services and food processing and distribution.

Fourth, any individual unit or industry whose wage and price decisions are "unreasonably inconsistent" with the goal of price stability may be folded into the mandatory component of the program.

Altogether, Phase III creates a free-form scenario that aims at maximizing the public's responsibility and the government's flexibility in responding to threats to economic stability.

The initial definition of the standard(s) of

performance for the stabilization program had a clear logic. The rate of inflation was to be brought down to a range of 2-3% by the end of 1972.

During 1972, wage behavior generally has conformed to the pay standard while price increases have fallen slightly beyond the outer limits of the overall price goal. Against this background, any adjustment of the wage and price targets posed a dilemma. To raise the standards would provide fresh tinder for inflation. On the other hand, price behavior has not been sufficiently auspicious to lower the level of permissible wage increases. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Administration has essentially retained the same price goal for 1973 as for 1972.

The organizational structure of Phase II fit the traditional pattern. Semi-independent agencies were established for prices and wages and a separate agency, the Cost of Living Council, was given broad policy and coordinating functions. A concern for bureaucratic efficiency alone would have dictated a single agency but it was overbalanced by the requirements of tripartitism on the wage side. With the walk-off of the labor members in March as vestigial quality, but it has worked with tolerable efficiency.

The organization for Phase III attempts to reap the benefits of administrative efficiency while accommodating the political requirements of the program. The Price Commission and the Pay Board are consigned to the bureaucratic boneyard and overall responsibility will be lodged with a beefed-up Cost of Living Council. Major interest groups are brought into the program through an advisory labor-management committee. The return of organized labor to the stabilization program is particularly important. In a democracy, the effectiveness of controls ultimately depends upon a consensus of those who must ultimately bear the program's restraint. With the confirmation of this consensus, the critical administrative problem will be to implement an effective compliance program which clarifies the complexities of the coverage provisions.

Last, the blueprint for Phase III clearly incorporates a strategy for disengagement. The recent experience has revealed that controls are not self-liquidating. With almost biblical inevitability each "phase" may beget reactions which necessitate still another stage of control. Phase III provides a basic dosage of controls while seeking to avert addiction.

Not everyone would agree that 1973 should see the abandonment of controls. Some view the present exercise as a step in the evolution of a permanent form of incomes policy to deal with the problems of inflation and employment. Others regard this prospect with distaste.

If we can divert ourselves from the monthly palpitations of the Consumer Price Index, this a propitious time to move the debate from the seminar room to the public domain. At the least, the issue can be discussed on the basis of fresh experience rather than nostalgia or dogma.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE A STRONGER PARTNER IN NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, every day, in newspapers, in radio and television commentaries, and in constituent correspondence, Members of Congress are becoming increasingly aware that a loss of public confidence in the U.S. Congress is contributing to many an American's sense of frustration and alienation from their Government. In fact, I was deeply saddened to learn from a recent Harris poll that less than 25 percent of the American people hold

confidence in Congress as the determiner of our national priorities and policies.

I feel this is a shocking statistic to be associated with the one body in our Government which is in theory supposed to be directly representative of the people and the public will. More than the other two branches of our Government, Congress belongs to the people because it functions as a democratic, deliberative, decisionmaking body where national issues and priorities can be openly and intelligently debated. Or at least this is the kind of body Congress is supposed to be and that it must become.

To take the first steps toward this goal, the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) and I presided over 3 days of hearings before our Special Ad Hoc Committee on Congressional Reform to solicit opinions from experts within and without the Government on the most important reform measures. While the suggestions presented to our committee were diverse, the one overwhelming conclusion was that Congress can and must restore itself to its rightful position as the determiner of our national priorities. When this happens, I have no doubt that the American public will again confidently rely on Congress and on its government in general.

As evidence that congressional reform is not a mere internal "housekeeping" matter, Time Inc., has chosen the role of Congress as its special theme to explore in conjunction with its 50th anniversary. I was privileged to participate in one of its public seminars on this subject not long ago, and I was encouraged by the thoughtful exchange of ideas on the need for congressional reform.

In close association with this seminar, Max Ways has written for Fortune magazine an article entitled "The Congress Should Be a Stronger Partner in National Policy." The article contains a general discussion of many of the problems we have already discussed among ourselves, and it broadens our understanding of the issue by bringing new perspectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Way's article be printed in the RECORD. I hope that Senators will have an opportunity to look it over.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Fortune magazine, January 1973]

CONGRESS SHOULD BE A STRONGER PARTNER IN NATIONAL POLICY

(By Max Ways)

American reform movements have a tendency to deal with the institution they wish to cure much as Charles II's physicians treated his last illness. They bled him. They blistered him from head to foot with hot metal. They gave him purge after purge, using, among other medicaments, a salt extracted from human skulls. They made him inhale powders to induce sneezing. While this was going on, they fed him broth laced with cream of tartar and a light ale brewed without hops. When he complained of his discomforts (mildly, for he was a polite and considerate man), the doctors strictly bade him be silent—a milestone, perhaps, in the march of the experts to domination over sovereignty. After a few days, mercifully, Charles died. Nobody could accuse the doctors of underestimating his sickness (prob-

ably cerebral hemorrhage) or of timidity in their prescriptions.

Anxiety over the condition of Congress is, indeed, justified. But some of those who worry about it, in their zeal to recruit other citizens to their viewpoint, adopt diagnoses and propose therapies characterized by the usual reformist overkill. Congress is said to be the government's weakest link—its procedures sclerotic, its leaders senile, and its very nature unsuited to modern life.

Such alarmist premises for the reform of Congress have the immediate effect of further weakening public confidence in that institution. Already, lack of trust in Congress contributes to frustration, alienation, and discord among the citizenry. And it concentrates upon the White House an unrealistic burden of hope and responsibility.

A soldier base from which to move toward better congressional performance is suggested by a look at the persuasive changes that have occurred in government generally in the last hundred years—especially the rise of a huge and expert bureaucracy. This new element is the governmental reflection of more profound changes in U.S. society.

A bureaucracy, though indispensable to a twentieth-century nation, has very severe limitations—or blind spots—when the country and the world around it are caught up in accelerating and unending change. Not only do circumstances change, but people's goals, desires, and values are changing too. Because the popular will in the U.S. is becoming both more important and harder to read, the quality of Congress—the people's branch—takes on more significance with every decade.

Seen in that perspective, much talk about congressional weakness is irrelevant to the key questions. For example, when President Nixon after the 1972 election moved to improve coordination within the executive branch, there was journalistic hand wringing over whether his moves would further undermine the position of Congress. The assumption that any strengthening of the executive branch must inevitably weaken Congress is a superficial reading of the situation. Congress is not strengthened by confusion and inefficiency elsewhere in government. The challenges to policy making that confront this nation require an improved quality in all branches.

A BUTT OF CARTOONISTS

To be sure, congressional reform is overdue. A box on page 171 proposes some remedies, less drastic than blood and blisters, for specific defects in congressional procedures. But it is important to keep in mind that internal reform does not touch all aspects of "the trouble with Congress." Part of the problem lies elsewhere in the government and part of it lies in the long decline in the public reputation of Congress. This decline has been caused less by the shortcomings of Congress itself than by defects in the processes through which public reputation is made.

After all, generations of cartoonists and satirists have had fun with Congress. Hundreds of editorialists and political scientists have deplored it as an obstacle to the vigorous presidential leadership they prized. Small wonder that so many impatient citizens, ill informed about how Congress works, have come to blame it for faults that may lie elsewhere in the political structure. Reforms in Congress won't do much good unless other elements in the body politic—including the press and the public—alter the way they look upon Congress.

Nor can that misleading phrase, "the decline of Congress," be applied to its individual members. The average quality of Congressmen has almost certainly been rising through the twentieth century. Congressmen now are better educated, alert to a wider range of complex issues. They work harder than their predecessors did. Thanks to air travel and modern communications, they

keep in much more direct touch with their constituencies. Many members are well informed, to a degree that would surprise outsiders, on national and international topics to which they have given particular attention. The ethical rules of Congress need tightening, and individual cases of graft appear from time to time; nevertheless, considering the temptations to magnificent congressional malfeasance that now abound, it can be said that Congress today is as honorable a body of public servants as has sat in that place for a hundred and fifty years.

Absent are giants to vie in stature with Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Thaddeus Stevens, or Robert Taft, but the men and women who get elected these days are no moral or intellectual pygmies. The nation is not told enough about Congress to appreciate such examples of conscience, patriotism, and quiet ability as Senators Mike Mansfield and George Aiken. The national limelight spots some Senators primarily as presidential possibilities. But Hubert Humphrey and Edward Kennedy, to take two examples, have contributed more to the Senate than most of their partisans appreciate.

Outside their own states, members of the House of Representatives are almost completely unknown to readers of newspapers and watchers of television. Who hears about Michigan's Martha Griffiths, one of the ablest members of the Ways and Means Committee? Illinois' John Anderson, Minnesota's Albert Quale, Missouri's Richard Bolling, Arizona's Morris Udall, Oregon's Edith Green, Massachusetts' Silvio Conte, New Jersey's Frank Thompson, and fifty others would be a credit to any U.S. Congress that ever convened.

Collectively, the U.S. Congress has held its head higher than any other national legislature amidst the tide of executive power that has risen throughout the world. Britain's House of Commons, though its debates still glitter, is overregimented by party discipline. The lack of really influential standing committees devoted to specified subject areas leaves the Commons helpless to resist Cabinets that control (or, in some cases, are controlled by) knowledgeable civil servants. While many parliaments on the Continent and elsewhere contain an enviable number of brilliant members, no foreign parliament today equals the U.S. Congress in organized competence, in responsiveness to the people, and in independence of the executive will.

THE POND GROWS FASTER THAN THE FROG

Despite all these signs of health and strength, there is a "trouble with Congress." The pathology begins to appear not when it is compared with nineteenth-century Congresses, or with legislatures in other lands, but rather when its loss of power to the executive is scrutinized. Whether this shift has gone too far is a question that has to be appraised in the light of the novel political challenges generated by recent and prospective trends in the nature of U.S. society.

Congress was at the height of its dominance after the Civil War, when it controlled even the patronage of the executive branch. Since then the governmental pond has grown much faster than the congressional frog. Professor Robert A. Dahl of Yale has summed up the change this way: "In the post-Civil War period Congress enjoyed a monopoly control over policies mostly of trivial importance; today Congress shares with the President control over policies of profound consequence. Congress has, then, both lost and acquired power."

Dahl emphasizes the magnification of the federal government's total power. "In the post-Civil War period, during a time when the doctrine of complete laissez-faire marched triumphant and the foreign policy of the United States limited the country to a role of neutrality and isolation, there was, in plain fact, very little policy for either

the President or the Congress to initiate and to enact. But, in the twentieth century, governmental regulation and control, welfare programs, foreign affairs, military policy, and the taxation and spending measures required for all these purposes have produced a veritable 'policy explosion.'"

The succinct picture of what happened in government, true as far as it goes, omits the huge change that occurred outside of government. Policy—the sustained application of power toward the attainment of conscious goals—was exploding in all parts of the society. Throughout the twentieth century, business corporations, nonprofit organizations, and individuals have all increased their goal-pursuing capabilities.

Mass prosperity is the most obvious and generalized evidence of this multiplied power. But many sources of the risen standard of living lie outside the strictly material realm. They include the much higher educational level, the huge reservoir of specialized knowledge and skills, and the ability to mobilize these toward particular targets of action.

The framers of the Constitution had only rudimentary intimations of the kind of knowledge and the kind of action that were to characterize all facets of twentieth-century society. If John Quincy Adams ran the Department of State in 1820 with about ten clerks and a messenger to help him, that was because no such creature then existed as, for example, an expert on how Japan's culture affected its trade policy? A Department of Housing and Urban Development was not invented until the possibility of solutions had created a national consciousness of "urban problems." In many fields an explosion of policy has arisen from the proliferation of competence.

Governmentally, most specialized competence found its home in the executive branch. Expertise came to be recognized as a force apart from the traditional political structure, which had rested upon such characteristics as personal probity, common sense, and an ability to identify with the values and aims of the people. Implicit in the very nature of specialized knowledge was an independence of politics that later became protected and institutionalized by civil-service tenure.

In the last third of the nineteenth century, Presidents struggled with Congress for control over the growing power represented by the departments. History awards the presidency a clear victory in that struggle, but it would be truer to say that the real winner was the fourth branch, the bureaucracy. Both the presidency and the Congress are still adjusting to the implications of that development.

Whether inside or outside government, specialized knowledge, organized toward narrow goals of achievement, sets up new requirements for coordination. In the society, millions of separate and waxing "power centers" (corporations, associations, and families), each pursuing self-selected goals by means of its own peculiar array of competence, require a stronger governmental hand to perform coordinative functions in the general interest (e.g., in environmental protection). The muscle for stronger government is provided by the same growth of competence that characterizes the society itself and creates the need for stronger government.

But this augmented base of governmental power is also fragmented by specialization. The government's experts, each blinkered to concentrate on his own area of action, cannot be expected to coordinate themselves, or to give cohesion and direction to the nation as a whole.

Faced with this double challenge from multiplicity, does the mind automatically turn to Congress, another set of diversities? Rather, the almost instinctive reaction is:

find a unity to bring order. The spotlight swings toward the "lonely man in the White House," who happens, moreover, to be (at least nominally) in charge of those hordes of experts.

It isn't surprising, then, that for three generations many scholars, journalists, and federal officeholders—including Congressmen—have seen the development of presidential primary as "modern" and right. In this plausible picture, Congress recedes toward irrelevance. It can act as a check and watchdog over executive action. It can modify, postpone, and block. But it cannot initiate top policy, or play a constructive and responsible part in shaping it.

If this view of the government in a twentieth-century society were true, there would be no need to worry about either the performance or the reputation of Congress. It would quietly fade. But there are reasons—some pragmatic, some derived from democratic theory—for challenging the view that Congress doesn't matter anymore.

AN INSIDE JOB GOES WRONG

Time and time again, when the authorship of high policy is heavily concentrated in presidential hands in the exclusion of Congress, the outcome seems to be disappointing. This is true even in the areas of foreign affairs and military affairs where the presidential prerogative has the strongest constitutional claims, supported by cogent arguments arising from the executive's superior access to relevant knowledge.

The case for presidential monopoly in foreign policy had been immensely strengthened by the precedent of World War II, and strengthened further by the haunting postwar fear of atomic attack. That "ten-minutes-to-decide" scenario, hypnotizing every mind, seemed to eliminate Congress from any key part in the process. After Truman's brave and lonely decision on Korea, it seemed to be settled that the great decisions of international affairs were the exclusive preserve of the White House.

Then Vietnam, that least sudden of all American wars, recalled us to recognition that even in a nuclear age most major international policies can—and should—be determined through the serious deliberation of more than one elected representative of the people. Is it an accident that Vietnam, the most internally divisive foreign war the U.S. ever fought, has been from first to last also the most presidential, and the least congressional, of our wars? The steps determining the long, gradual escalation of the U.S. military effort in Vietnam were neither hasty nor reckless nor ill informed. For decision after decision, tremendous thrusts of expertise were made available to the White House.

But somehow it was all too much of an inside job. Moral issues were not discussed as early and as publicly as they should have been. No truly representative forum handled questions of priority between Vietnam and competing claims on federal money. To many citizens the war came to seem not only a blunder, but an illegitimate political act, a usurpation.

HOW THE BUDGET GOT OUT OF CONTROL

Internally, the most glaring governmental trouble in the U.S. today is inability to control the federal spending budget. This failure can no longer be blamed on Vietnam, nor on neo-Keynesian economists, nor on crypto-socialists. There's some deep procedural flaw here, some undesirable mutation in the evolution of the nation's policymaking process.

Through English history, "the power of the purse" had been the core around which other functions of the legislature gradually accumulated. Until well into the twentieth century it was understood in U.S. politics that

Congress had almost exclusive control over the levels of taxes and expenditures. But as federal activities became wider and more complex, officials and observers recognized a need for an integrated federal budget. In line with the theories of expanded presidential leadership that were popular even then, Congress in 1921 passed the Budget and Accounting Act creating a Bureau of the Budget and giving the President a large share of responsibility for coordinating the fiscal policies of the government.

A unified federal budget, enabling officials and citizens to see the Big Picture, was without doubt a logical, businesslike step. But the new system was also a step in the process of shifting fiscal responsibility off the shoulders of Congress. For some years it has been difficult to tell whether the President or Congress should be held accountable for an aggregate spending level that neither defends.

Since the great depression and the New Deal, Presidents have taken—or had thrust upon them—responsibility for maintaining the stability and growth of the economy by using the leverage of the federal surplus or deficit. How the taxing and appropriating functions of Congress relate to this new presidential responsibility for macro-economic policy has never been clarified. It is conceded, of course, that Congress will be allowed to have its way on this detail or that; but as to the Big Picture, initiative belongs to the White House and the experts. Not many years ago, enthusiasts of presidential leadership were talking about "fine tuning" the economy to a point of delicacy and precision that would have further constricted the congressional role. Proposals were put forward that Congress give the President discretionary power to change tax rates, according to whether he thought the economy needed stimulation or restraint.

A peak in the trend toward presidential responsibility for fiscal policy may have been reached last October, when the House of Representatives voted to give the President power to limit expenditures to \$250 billion in the current fiscal year, regardless of the specific appropriations Congress had voted. The House action (in which the Senate, wisely, did not concur) is a reminder that the presidency has not exactly taken power away from Congress at gunpoint. Too often, congressional leaders have been glad to dodge responsibility by handing power over to the executive.

BUT WHO ARE "THE PEOPLE"?

Until quite recently, most informed observers would have been in favor of resolving the confusion of function by moving still more fiscal authority from the Capitol to the White House. But opinion has been shifting. The current generation of political scientists includes many close students of governmental trends who believe that the erosion of the congressional policymaking role has already gone too far.

The most cogent reasons for this dawning pro-Congress sentiment may be found in changes that have been occurring in the electorate. In democratic theory, control over all legitimate political power belongs to "the people." But in the U.S. today "the people" stands for an almost infinite diversity whose multitudinous desires do not readily coalesce into political policy.

When the U.S. began, this was a quite homogeneous nation with more than 90 percent of the population dependent on one occupation, farming. As the U.S. was industrializing, many observers believed that the majority of its people would come to resemble the faceless nineteenth-century European proletariat. But the actual evolution in the U.S., especially in the period from 1945 to the present, has been very different. Mass production and mass education did not produce a mass culture or a mass politics.

In today's politics, neither class nor regional lines are sharply drawn. The electorate is numerically dominated by a huge "middle" quite unlike the classic bourgeoisie. This majority can't be permanently enrolled under the banner of property or any other single cause or slogan. More and more voters refuse to affiliate with any party. Of those who do affiliate, millions switch parties from election to election, attaching importance first to one issue, then another. Interest groups are numerous, and the intensity of their loyalty varies. Moreover, many of the most important "interests" in U.S. politics today do not have group economic advantage as their goal. Their overriding concern may be peace or law and order or the quality of the environment—concerns that do not correlate neatly with such characteristics as income or occupation or geographical region of residence. People who think of themselves as individuals—and not as "workers" or Pennsylvanians—naturally attach importance to the personalities and records of individual candidates.

Many individual voters, moreover, feel strongly on both sides of certain issues, shifting position almost from day to day. The same voter may demand peace and also a strong U.S. posture in foreign affairs. There's no clear political split between those who pay the taxes and those who demand government services. The same voter insists on lower spending levels and better schools and expensive sewerage and more public transport.

So much diversity and volatility make for a subtle and complex politics. Only Congress in all its diversity can represent the heterogeneous nature of the electorate. However nonpartisan he may feel, a man in the White House cannot be "President of all the people." A very large number of voters will not regard the President of the day as *their* President. Most of these voters should be able to find some Congressman, not necessarily from their own district, who comes over to them on their own wavelength. In that event, there is less chance that such dissident voters will be alienated from the whole political process.

The ability of a President to stay in touch with the people has been affected also by the decline of the political parties. A President is still the leader of his party, but parties are feeble compared to the organizations of fifty years ago. They cannot today carry heavy loads of two-way messages between the White House and the grass roots. And even such appealing personalities as Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy have had trouble staying in touch with the people through journalistic media, which do not transmit the dialogue of leadership as sensitively as the old party organizations used to do.

A member of Congress is in a quite different situation. He can't rely on media. To hang onto his job he has to stay in touch with his constituency by his own exertions and those of his staff. He will refuse to risk electoral defeat by following a President of his own party, or on some specific measure he will vote to support a President of the opposite party.

Accordingly, deadlocks don't necessarily occur when, as now, a President of one party faces a Congress with majorities belonging to the other party in "control" of both houses. Nixon's 1972 landslide failed to alter the congressional balance—a striking example of voter independence, of which the independence of members of Congress is a reflection.

AVOIDING THAT CAN OF WORMS

For decades many American intellectuals who comment upon politics have hoped that the U.S. would move toward a European-type party system—disciplined, doctrinal, class-based, sharply defined. In fact, the U.S. has moved toward less sharply defined parties. A landslide defeat ensued when, in 1964, the Republican presidential nominee tried to

focus the party image on its conservative wing. Last year the Democratic nominee met the same fate in striving for a sharply liberal party image. What many would-be simplifiers fail to appreciate is that the flexibility and the breadth of both parties, especially as these qualities appear in Congress, echo the diversity of the people. It is the actual character of the present (and probable future) U.S. electorate that forms the strongest argument for an elevation of congressional influence in national policy.

A resurgence of congressional importance would be so consistent with the deep-seated trends in U.S. society that one has to ask why such a trend has not, in fact, emerged. One obstacle is journalism. The most serious distortion in journalism is not its much discussed "liberal" bias or any other kind of partisan slant. The basic bias of journalists is not ideological but occupational; they favor stories that can be readily communicated to the public. The President—any President—is easier to write about than any congressional situation. Journalists minimize the importance of Congress because they are reluctant to explain that "can of worms." This neglect, in turn, leads to an actual reduction of the power of Congress, because public expectation clusters around the more readily communicable person of the President. In this society, which is perhaps more democratic than is usually supposed, power tends to go where the people think it is.

When President Kennedy asked Lawrence O'Brien to serve as his liaison with Congress, O'Brien was chagrined to discover how few congressional leaders he knew, despite his intense involvement in politics. To remedy this, he began giving a series of Sunday brunches at his home to which he invited congressional leaders, some fellow Kennedy aides, and some Washington journalists. Again and again at these brunches, correspondents who had been covering Washington for decades asked, "Who's he?" indicating a chairman or a ranking member of some important congressional committee. The fact that only half of Americans can name their Congressman is not entirely to be blamed on voter "apathy." Journalists who will risk life and limb to find out what the President had for breakfast wouldn't walk around the corner to hear a Congressman deliver a reasoned explanation of his vote.

In an occupational—not a political—sense, journalism has a strong conservative bias, a tendency to use today the standards of significance and of news judgment that prevailed yesterday. Every active U.S. journalist grew up and learned his trade in an era when what counted in policy was the White House. Both he and his readers are conditioned by a pattern established in the first half of this century. Switching the spotlight to Congress would run the risk of boring or puzzling readers—a risk that professional communicators, who desire above all else to communicate, are loath to run.

A NEED FOR BETTER BRIDGES

Nevertheless, the movement for a resurgent Congress probably will make headway in the years to come, despite journalistic and other forms of inertia. What goes on in Washington is not a simple tug-of-war between branches of government. Just as Congress gave way to the rising expertise of the executive branch, so Presidents in the future may be happy to see Congress have a larger share of responsibility for policy.

What Congress needs most is better bridges to the executive branch, where the experts reside, where policy is now prepared, carried out, and evaluated. For that, Congress needs more expertise of its own. Much stronger informational support will be required if Congress is to improve its ability to form judgments about such highly complex matters as

weapon systems, manpower retraining, international trade, and the economic effects of taxation.

The support available to Congress has been strengthened in recent years. The Congressional Reference Service of the Library of Congress has been expanded; it should be further upgraded. More important has been the gradual redefinition of that little-known arm of Congress, the General Accounting Office. The G.A.O. has been moving toward more difficult assignments intended to ensure that congressional purposes are actually carried out. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut has introduced a bill that would further broaden the G.A.O.'s activity along this line.

Heaven forbid that Congress should develop a massive parallel bureaucracy, with its own specialists dealing with their opposite numbers in the departments. But it could use a staff of its own, somewhat analogous to the White House staff, a few hundred lively, policy-oriented people looking for governmental careers broader and more exciting than those available on the civil-service escalator.

BEYOND EXPERTISE

Improved staffing would help Congress to restore its sadly reduced role in policy making. With all its resources of specialized knowledge, the executive branch is not a trustworthy creator of national policy. Contemporary life is haunted by the fear of unbridled expertise. As President Kennedy lamented after the Bay of Pigs: "All my life I've known better than to depend on the experts. How could I have been so stupid, to let them go ahead?"

A society immersed in internal and external change needs a policy-making body that can foresee the gestation of problems and issues within the complex life of the people. A bureaucracy cannot represent or integrate or express the popular will. Bureaucrats, indeed, are notoriously insensitive to changes occurring in the periphery of their assigned tasks. And Presidents must devote much of their energies to administering the vast and busy apparatus of government. The original division of function was that the executive branch should carry out the popular will as formed and expressed by the Congress. In the decades ahead, that division will seem wiser than at any time in the past.

AN AGENDA FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

To support congressional reforms, one need not believe that Congress is generally corrupt, or unresponsive to the people, or hopelessly inefficient, or under the thumb of a tiny coterie of evil old men. None of these allegations is true. Still, Congress, like any other institution, needs periodic overhauls to tighten up some rules that invite abuse and to relax or discard other rules that hamper or distort action.

Ethics. In almost any body of 535 members, dealing each year with measures involving billions of dollars, at least a few outright crooks are bound to appear from time to time. Some other members, not outright crooks, can be led into corrupt practices if they believe "that's the way the system works." When a scandal involving a Congressman breaks into the open, the public has no way of knowing whether that case is exceptional or whether one Congressman happened to be caught at what most others had been doing without exposure. Since it's impossible to prove all the others innocent, the public asks whether the congressional rules of conduct are as strict as they ought to be and whether Congress is doing enough to expose and punish infractions. When the answer to both questions is no, the public's faith in the honesty of Congress as an institution is impaired.

Most of the ethical problems fall into two areas: campaign contributions and conflicts

of interest. The best preventive in both areas is more disclosure.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 went part way—but not far enough—toward establishing some new ground rules for contributions. It requires that contributions be reported, but provisions for enforcement are not as stringent as they ought to be. Reasonable limits should be set on how much any donor can give to all candidates, or to any one candidate, and how much any candidate can receive from all donors. When an individual or organization gives hundreds of thousands to a candidate's campaign, the public will presume that favors are expected in return. Since the donor can't prove his motives are pure as the driven snow, which they just possibly may be, the only practical alternative is to forbid these big gifts.

Rules on conflict of interest are quite strictly enforced upon appointees of the executive branch—but not upon members of Congress. Years ago, when a seat in Congress was an ill-paid part-time job, it would have been impractical, and perhaps unfair, to forbid a member of Congress to keep an interest in a law firm that represented clients before federal agencies. But now that members of Congress have full-time jobs, paying \$42,500 a year, the conflict-of-interest rules seem excessively lax.

"Sunshine rules." Too much important congressional work is done with no outside scrutiny. A number of states now have laws requiring all public bodies, including legislative committees, to admit the press and public to their sessions. Such requirements that "the sun shine" into meeting rooms may sound onerous, but they work. Without doubt, the press would pay more attention to Congress if reporters could be present when the crucial decisions are being made in committee rooms. Who votes for what in committees and subcommittees may be more significant than who votes for what on the floor.

Hearings and reports. Journalists eagerly cover those congressional committee hearings where witnesses (e.g., the late Joseph Valachi) toss out sensational scraps of information. Too seldom, however, do committees make any serious attempt to add up the results of hearings in a summary report. On a subject such as tax reform a careful scrutiny of the so-called "loopholes" would make valuable information available to the citizen. Individual committee members could marshal arguments for and against each "loophole." Committee reports of high analytical quality could become effective vehicles of congressional initiative.

Seniority. Yesterday's reform can petrify into today's abuse. That's what has happened to the seniority system in the House of Representatives. Early in this century, the power of the Speaker to appoint committee chairmen led to a grotesque concentration of power. Selection by seniority of service on a committee was deemed a fairer, more objective system. But in recent decades seniority has been so rigidly observed that committee chairmen (who have more power than they should) include some who are more notable for longevity than for ability. Because of the seniority system, many distinguished middle-aged citizens who might make a real contribution to the deliberations of Congress never become candidates. A fifty-year-old is likely to feel that he would not live long enough to rise to a point of effectiveness on the seniority escalator. (The chairmen of the ten most important committees have served an average of thirty-one years in the House.)

At present and most chairmen come from districts that are safely Democratic, and most ranking minority members now come from districts that are safely Republican. Such an atypical district does not necessarily produce the best or most responsive Congressmen.

Terms and elections. The present two-year House term is so short that members are over-

burdened by campaigning. Since nearly all Representatives now make frequent visits to their constituencies, there's no point in requiring that they come home to campaign every two years. A four-year term for Representatives, with elections held midway between presidential elections, could help to get the Capitol out of the shadow of the White House. This change in Representatives' terms would require a constitutional amendment, which Washington observers say could never pass the Senate—because it would give Representatives a chance to run for the Senate without resigning from the House. But with enough public pressure that Senate resistance would give way.

EL PASO BUSINESS COMMUNITY OFFERS FARAH SOLID SUPPORT

Mr. TOWER, Mr. President, the president of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, George Janzen, issued a statement for the chamber this fall which deals with an important labor rights and labor law question affecting many of my constituents in the El Paso area. This question involved is the extent of the rights of employees to be free from the coercive tactics of a nationally organized boycott and a nationally directed walkout intended to force a company and its employees to deal with a particular union, in spite of the opposition of a majority of the employees of the company involved to representation by such union.

I think that the facts in this case need to be made clear, in view of the widespread and often distorted publicity being generated about this case. Mr. Janzen's statement can serve to bring this matter into better focus for all who have heard about this case and who are interested in the rights of the labor force to be free from coercive actions by powerful industrywide unions.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EL PASO BUSINESS COMMUNITY OFFERS FARAH SOLID SUPPORT

George Janzen, president of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce and president of the Southwest National Bank in this city, positioned the business community solidly behind Farah Manufacturing Company in his "President's Message" to the Chamber membership at the annual banquet Tuesday night, September 26, 1972.

Following are those portions of Mr. Janzen's text that relate to Farah's current labor unrest and an attempted boycott of Farah merchandise in retail stores.

As leaders of the El Paso Business Community, we must always be concerned about our future. Protection of individual rights, a system of free enterprise, and the orderly process of law must be a guaranteed part of that future.

We have found that in the current strike against the Farah Manufacturing Company, the truth has been obscured and concealed. We see individuals far from the source of the problem demonstrating an alarming tendency to make flat statements and public pronouncements for personal gain without full investigation of both sides of the issue. The result? . . . A distortion of facts and bad publicity for our community. When the matter is as close to home as the Farah strike (and affects the way our community is

viewed throughout the U.S.) we believe that all facts must be known. It is our responsibility as business leaders to report our conclusions.

We reaffirm our belief that this dispute must be decided by due process of law and we are firmly opposed to the use of pressure and intimidation to force a decision.

We uphold the right to individual freedom as defined by our legal system . . . not only for those attempting to organize a company, but also for those workers who wish to oppose such organization. Equally, a company executive is entitled to the freedom of directing his business affairs the way he deems fit within the same legal structure. However, when a minority of Farah's more-than-9,500 employees are able to utilize the national resources and manpower of organized labor against the company to impose their will on the overwhelming majority . . . when some of the nation's most prominent politicians deal themselves in against the company without sufficient knowledge of the facts . . . then it is time those of us who still believe in fair play and the American free enterprise system stand up and be counted.

Not only be counted with respect to Farah's treatment by organized labor, but the treatment of all El Pasoans and the impact on the image of El Paso . . . (which began to darken with the ASARCO suit) and now becomes darker and more distorted.

The Farah company is a good corporate member of our community . . . the company is truly an El Paso success story. From its beginning in 1920 when Farah employed 4 persons, it has become a leader in the casual clothing field employing at its peak 9,500 people.

All El Pasoans are affected in some way by Farah's operations. The Farah annual payroll amounts to 40 million dollars and millions more are generated by purchase of local products and services.

Many facts in this dispute have been overlooked by outsiders, and (unfortunately) by some El Pasoans. In fairness I feel that these facts should be emphasized:

Since May of this year when the walkout began, there has been little evidence of escalation. 7,500 employees are still working and Farah's production is at an adequate level to meet market conditions and their deliveries to customers continue uninterrupted.

The fact that the strike has not expanded should be evidence that Farah's position is in line with the large majority of employees who do not want a union.

This attitude of the employees still on the job is due to the benefits they receive, good working conditions, and to the fact that Farah wages are among the highest paid in the El Paso garment industry.

Farah has abided by all court decisions. The courts, however, have issued restraining orders against the union for unrestricted picketing which resulted in arrests for violation of the Texas State Mass Picketing Statute.

We as community leaders must recognize that a minority is attempting to force a majority to accept their wishes. 2,000 are attempting to tell 7,500 persons what to do.

For the first time (to my knowledge) the AFL-CIO Executive Council on July 19, 1972, has endorsed the nationwide boycott of a branded product. This support of local unionization efforts by national boycott departs from accepted standards, is damaging to the community, and is unfair to Farah and to all of El Paso.

Permit me to read one of several letters received by the Chamber. This one is from Getzville, New York. "Sirs: You are probably aware that the reputation of your city is in danger of becoming infamous, due to the inexcusable repressive tactics against workers by Farah and your police department. Here's

hoping that the nation hears news of justice in El Paso very soon."

This past week as covered in the Wall Street Journal Farah announced, Quote "That it was notified by the National Labor Relations Board that a representation election scheduled for next Thursday at the Company's San Antonio plants has been postponed."

The Company said it had notified the NLRB's Houston office it was willing to hold the election on that day. However, the company said, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, which is seeking to organize workers at the plant, refused to file a similar agreement for the election at that time." End Quote.

A spokesman for the union in New York said the NLRB postponed the election because the union has filed a new set of unfair labor practice charges against the company.

According to Farah both parties had filed unfair labor practice charges with the NLRB. This appears to be another union tactic to delay in order to gather additional support for the eventual election.

It is unacceptable to us that a local company should be harmed and a community suffer (now and in the future) to force a decision of primary benefit to individuals who do not live and work in our city.

We support Farah and all their employees in their desire for a constructive and just decision in this dispute. When Farah products are being boycotted in a nationwide action, fair treatment and an equal hearing is not possible. Nor can we as a community stand by while American business and industry removes El Paso from its prospect list because the voice of its leadership has not been heard.

We call on all citizens of El Paso and American consumers to stand with us, resist this boycott and turn the decision away from a system of "trial in the market place."

TRIBUTE TO MELVIN LAIRD, OUTGOING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today, I wish to commend the outgoing Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, on one of the finest records of any cabinet level officer in American history. Faced with the most difficult of defense problems, Secretary Laird responded with programs that were reasoned, not rhetorical.

When he entered office, Melvin Laird saw procurement programs that often resulted in notable cost overruns and a less than notable product. The Defense Department has now changed to a "fly-before-you-buy" policy and while this approach may not be useful in all development and procurement contracts, that is, an aircraft carrier, it does hold out the promise of letting Congress know beforehand what it is buying.

The Secretary of Defense was faced with draft calls of nearly 300,000 the year before he took office. Nevertheless, he responded to the desires of the majority of Americans by formulating plans for a transition to an all-volunteer armed force. These plans included a "face-lift" for outdated regulations covering service life, new construction for our military installations, and significant pay raises for the lower ranks. These seeds have borne fruit, for we face draft calls of only 5,000 for this calendar year.

In 1968, we were confronted with an expanded involvement in Southeast

Asia, and as a result of this involvement, a significantly expanded force structure. Secretary Laird had the perplexing problem of reducing this force structure by more than 1.2 million men and women and at the same time easing this transition from war to peace both on the individuals involved and on the economy. Despite the turbulence, we managed this transition probably better than in any major war.

Then, of course, there was the Vietnam war. Of all his problems, none was more complex for Mel Laird than providing the President with the military milieu in which to find a just and lasting peace. The seeming incongruity of applying military pressure in order to achieve peace required the most delicate judgment. Providing President Nixon with an alternative to the all-too-long deadlocked Paris peace talks meant training the South Vietnamese to fight for themselves—something for which they had demonstrated a disillusioning lack of desire. Nevertheless, Mel made the right decisions, and his Vietnamization program has been more successful than critics had thought possible. Today, we stand on the threshold of peace. There can be no greater tribute to Melvin Laird.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Tuesday next, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS McCLELLAN AND JACKSON ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, immediately following the recognition of the two leaders or their designees under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Tuesday next is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr.

NUNN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 45 minutes, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes.

It is intended by the leadership on Tuesday next to call up nominations on the Executive Calendar; namely, those of William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense, and James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be Director of Central Intelligence. I anticipate that there will be some discussion, and possibly a rollcall vote or rollcall votes on one or more of the nominations. I cannot say with absolute assurance that there will be such rollcall votes, but I think it would be well to anticipate them so that Senators may schedule their day accordingly.

Mr. President, it is now anticipated that the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Elliot Richardson to the Office of Secretary of Defense will occur on Thursday next.

Senators should be alerted to the possibility of a yeas-and-nays vote on the confirmation of Mr. Richardson's nomination on Thursday next.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 10:46 a.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 23, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL PROCEEDINGS

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1973

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

PROCESSION TO THE INAUGURAL PLATFORM

The Members of the House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker, Mr. CARL ALBERT, and the Clerk of the House (Mr. William Pat Jennings), proceeded to the inaugural platform and were seated in sections 1 and 4.

The Members of the Senate, headed by the President pro tempore (Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND), the majority whip (Senator ROBERT C. BYRD), the minority whip (Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN), the Secretary of the Senate (Mr. Francis R. Valeo), and the Chaplain of the Senate (Rev. L. R. Elson, D.D.), proceeded to the inaugural platform and were seated in section 4.

The Governors of the States were escorted by the secretary for the minority (Mr. J. Mark Trice) to the inaugural platform and were seated in section 3.

The members of the diplomatic corps, escorted by the secretary for the majority (Mr. J. Stanley Kimmitt), were seated in section 2 on the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the President's platform by Mr. Greer, administrative assistant to Senator COOK.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, preceded by the Court's Marshal and its clerk, were escorted to the President's platform by Mr. Sobsey, administrative assistant to Senator CANNON.

Mrs. Agnew was escorted to the President's platform by Mrs. Cannon.

Mrs. Nixon was escorted to the President's platform by Mrs. Cook.

The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate (Mr. William H. Wannall) and the Sergeant at Arms of the House (Mr. Kenneth R. Harding) escorted Vice President AGNEW to the President's platform. The Vice President was accompanied by Speaker ALBERT, Senator CANNON, Senator COOK, Senator SCOTT of Pennsylvania, Senator MANSFIELD, Representative GERALD R. FORD, and Representative O'NEILL.

The U.S. Marine Corps Band played ruffles and flourishes and "Hail Columbia."

The Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and the House and Executive Director William McWhorter Cochrane escorted President Nixon to the inaugural platform. The President was accompanied by Senator CANNON, Senator COOK, Representative GERALD R. FORD, Speaker ALBERT, Senator SCOTT of Pennsylvania, Senator MANSFIELD, and Representative O'NEILL. They were seated by Mr. Thomas N. Gay of the Congressional Inaugural Committee.

The U.S. Marine Corps Band played ruffles and flourishes and "Hail to the Chief."

THE INAUGURATION CEREMONIES

Senator COOK. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, my fellow citizens, I present for our invocation today Dr. E. V. Hill. Dr. Hill.

PRAYER

Dr. HILL. Let us pray. Our Father and our God, we thank Thee for the privilege of prayer. With this privilege we offer to You thanks for life and for abundant material and spiritual blessings. We thank Thee for the indications

of peace. We thank You for the various and varied peoples of our Nation, their unique contributions and heritage. We pray that all of us will more and more learn to live together, sharing one with another. We thank Thee for our Nation, its leadership, and for the process by which our leadership is chosen. Along with our thanks, our Father, we acknowledge and confess our sins against You and against one another. Help us to become more sensitive to that which offends Thee and hurts us. Father, our dependence upon Thee is evident. Though we have sought peace, we have wars. Though we have plenty, there is hunger. And though we are children of one Father we have seen hatred, malice, envy, and strife. Thus we plead for Your spiritual healing of the land. Fill us with Thy holy spirit that we may witness a great spiritual awakening. Our prayers today, Father, are especially for our Nation's President, President Richard Nixon and his family. Protect and bless them, we pray. Reveal by Your spirit in his mind Your will for this hour. Give to him vision to see and discern, ears to hear, a heart to feel, and courage to take a stand. As we join him today in victory and joy, may we as a people also commit ourselves to join him in the more difficult days of the future, so that as President he will not stand alone.

We pray for Vice President AGNEW and all of the people of all the branches of Government.

We pray for Godly peace among our leaders and a Godly fear on their part as they remember the certainty of their accountability to You and to their fellow men.

Grant, O God, that we see this year the commencement of a generation of peace among all of the peoples of the world. Grant these blessings, our Father, in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Senator COOK. We will now be favored with the inaugural fanfare, especially written and presented by the outstanding Marine Corps Band, under the direction of Lt. Col. Dale Hopper.

(The U.S. Marine Corps Band played the "Inaugural Fanfare.")

PRAYER

Senator COOK. Rabbi Seymour Siegel will now lead us in prayer.

Rabbi SIEGEL. O Lord, Creator of all beginnings: We thank You for the opportunity of starting anew. Today those whom we have chosen to lead our country—President Nixon and Vice President Spiro Agnew—pledge again their commitment to serve You and this great and blessed Nation. Grant them the wisdom to understand their true task; the courage to pursue it; and the health and vigor to persist in it.

O Lord, source of all peace: We ask You with all our hearts that we be granted peace, for which we all yearn. Bless us and our leaders with harmony, vision, and strength of purpose so that we may better fulfill our responsibilities to You and to our fellow man. Bring us nearer to You and thus closer to each other—for next to being Your children our greatest privilege is that we are brothers of each other.

On this historic occasion we praise You in ancient words of blessing:

ברוך אתה.

Blessed are You, O Lord our God, King of the Universe,

אשר חלק מכונו לבשר ודם

Who shares a portion of His glory with mortal man. Amen.

Senator COOK. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans: I present now the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Warren Burger, who will administer the oath of office to the Vice President.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Earl Burger, administered to the Vice President the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which the Vice President repeated as follows:

I, SPIRO THEODORE AGNEW, solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

PRAYER

Senator COOK. We will now have a prayer by His Eminence Iakovos.

His Eminence IAKOVOS. O Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the Creator and the Redeemer and the Comforter of all, Who art present everywhere, and fillest all things, bless we beseech Thee, our President and Vice President who, in apparent recognition of the awesome responsibilities of their offices, stand reverently before Thee, anticipating the fullness of Thy grace and of Thy wisdom. Immerse their minds in the radiant spirit of Thy truth, their hearts in the tenderness of Thy love, their conscience in the purity of Thy sanctity, their will in the light of Thy Commandments, their whole being in the bounties of Thy infinite mercies, and vest them with the splendor of Thy omnipotence so that they may overcome the wiles of the adversary, and fearlessly and victoriously respond to the prayerful expectations of our people and of the peoples throughout the world.

For we wrestle, our Lord, not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against wickedness in high places, conspiring and aiming at the destruction of the image, the conscience and the soul of man, for whom Thou hast shed Thy blood upon the cross. Illumine O Almighty One, our President to clearly perceive reality even though it is blurred by both confusion and disfigurement of truth; give him the vision to discern Thy presence and suffering where anguish and pain take their heaviest toll, and gird him with the ability to ever renew his commitment to Thee and to the exploited and suffering ones.

For Thou hast commanded us to be ever alert and duty bound and concerned in our fellow men's painful quest for justice and freedom and dignity and peace;

and to Thee, our only Master and servant of men, do we ascribe glory and adoration now and unto ages of ages. Amen.

Senator COOK. It will be our pleasure now to hear a presentation of "America the Beautiful" by the combined service academies chorus.

(The chorus presented "America the Beautiful.")

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT

Senator COOK. Now, fellow Americans, the Honorable Chief Justice will administer the oath of office to the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Chief Justice.

The Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Earl Burger, administered to the President the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Richard Nixon, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

(Four ruffles and flourishes, "Hail to the Chief," and 21-gun salute.)

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator COOK, Mrs. Eisenhower, and my fellow citizens of this great and good country we share together:

When we met here 4 years ago, America was bleak in spirit, depressed by the prospect of seemingly endless war abroad and of destructive conflict at home.

As we meet here today, we stand on the threshold of a new era of peace in the world. [Applause.]

The central question before us is: How shall we use that peace?

Let us resolve that this era we are about to enter will not be what other post-war periods have so often been: a time of retreat and isolation that leads to stagnation at home and invites new danger abroad.

Let us resolve that this will be what it can become: a time of great responsibilities greatly borne, in which we renew the spirit and the promise of America as we enter our third century as a nation.

This past year saw far-reaching results from our new policies for peace. By continuing to revitalize our traditional friendships, and by our missions to Peking and to Moscow, we were able to establish the base for a new and more durable pattern of relationships among the nations of the world. Because of America's bold initiatives, 1972 will be long remembered as the year of the greatest progress since the end of World War II toward a lasting peace in the world. [Applause.]

The peace we seek in the world is not the flimsy peace which is merely an interlude between wars, but a peace which can endure for generations to come.

It is important that we understand both the necessity and the limitations of America's role in maintaining that peace.

Unless we in America work to preserve the peace, there will be no peace.

Unless we in America work to preserve freedom, there will be no freedom.

But let us clearly understand the new nature of America's role, as a result of the new policies we have adopted over these past four years.

We shall respect our treaty commitments.

We shall support vigorously the principle that no country has the right to impose its will or rule on another by force.

We shall continue, in this era of negotiation, to work for the limitation of nuclear arms, and to reduce the danger of confrontation between the great powers.

We shall do our share in defending peace and freedom in the world. But we shall expect others to do their share. [Applause.]

The time has passed when America will make every other nation's conflict our own, or make every other nation's future our responsibility, or presume to tell the people of other nations how to manage their own affairs. [Applause.]

Just as we respect the right of each nation to determine its own future, we also recognize the responsibility of each nation to secure its own future.

Just as America's role is indispensable in preserving the world's peace, so is each nation's role indispensable in preserving its own peace.

Together with the rest of the world, let us resolve to move forward from the beginnings we have made. Let us continue to bring down the walls of hostility which have divided the world for too long, and to build in their place bridges of understanding—so that despite profound differences between systems of government, the people of the world can be friends. [Applause.]

Let us build a structure of peace in the world in which the weak are as safe as the strong—in which each respects the right of the other to live by a different system—in which those who would influence others will do so by the strength of their ideas, and not by the force of their arms.

Let us accept that high responsibility not as a burden, but gladly—gladly because the chance to build such a peace is the noblest endeavor in which a nation can engage; gladly, also because only if we act greatly in meeting our responsibilities abroad will we remain a great Nation, and only if we remain a great Nation will we act greatly in meeting our challenges at home.

We have the chance today to do more than ever before in our history to make life better in America—to ensure better education, better health, better housing, better transportation, a cleaner environment—to restore respect for law, to make our communities more livable—and to ensure the God-given right of every American to full and equal opportunity. [Applause.]

Because the range of our needs is so great—because the reach of our opportunities is so great—let us be bold in our determination to meet those needs in new ways.

Just as building a structure of peace abroad has required turning away from

old policies that failed, so building a new era of progress at home requires turning away from old policies that have failed.

Abroad, the shift from old policies to new has not been a retreat from our responsibilities, but a better way to peace.

And at home, the shift from old policies to new will not be a retreat from our responsibilities, but a better way to progress.

Abroad and at home, the key to those new responsibilities lies in the placing and the division of responsibility. We have lived too long with the consequences of attempting to gather all power and responsibility in Washington.

Abroad and at home, the time has come to turn away from the condescending policies of paternalism—of "Washington knows best." [Applause.]

A person can be expected to act responsibly only if he has responsibility. This is human nature. So let us encourage individuals at home and nations abroad to do more for themselves, to decide more for themselves. Let us locate responsibility in more places. Let us measure what we will do for others by what they will do for themselves. [Applause.]

That is why today I offer no promise of a purely governmental solution for every problem. We have lived too long with that false promise. In trusting too much in government, we have asked of it more than it can deliver. This leads only to inflated expectations, to reduced individual effort, and to a disappointment and frustration that erode confidence both in what government can do and in what people can do.

Government must learn to take less from people so that people can do more for themselves. [Applause.]

Let us remember that America was built not by government, but by people—not by welfare, but by work—not by shirking responsibility, but by seeking responsibility. [Applause.]

In our own lives, let each of us ask—not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself?

In the challenges we face together, let each of us ask—not just how can government help, but how can I help?

Your national government has a great and vital role to play. And I pledge to you that where this government should act, we will act boldly and we will lead boldly. But just as important is the role that each and every one of us must play, as an individual and as a member of his own community.

From this day forward, let each of us make a solemn commitment in his own heart: To bear his responsibility, to do his part, to live his ideals—so that together, we can see the dawn of a new age of progress for America, and together, as we celebrate our 200th anniversary as a nation, we can do so proud in the fulfillment of our promise to ourselves and to the world.

As America's longest and most difficult war comes to an end, let us again learn to debate our differences with civility and decency. [Applause.] And let each of us reach out for that one precious quality government cannot provide—a new level

of respect for the rights and feelings of one another, a new level of respect for the individual human dignity which is the cherished birthright of every American. [Applause.]

Above all else, the time has come for us to renew our faith in ourselves and in America.

In recent years, that faith has been challenged.

Our children have been taught to be ashamed of their country, ashamed of their parents, ashamed of America's record at home and of its role in the world.

At every turn, we have been beset by those who find everything wrong with America and little that is right. But I am confident that this will not be the judgment of history on these remarkable times in which we are privileged to live. [Applause.]

America's record in this century has been unparalleled in the world's history for its responsibility, for its generosity, for its creativity and for its progress.

Let us be proud that our system has produced and provided more freedom and more abundance, more widely shared, than any other system in the history of the world.

Let us be proud that in each of the four wars in which we have been engaged in this century, including the one we are now bringing to an end, we have fought not for our selfish advantage, but to help others resist aggression. [Applause.]

Let us be proud that by our bold, new initiatives, and by our steadfastness for peace with honor, we have made a breakthrough toward creating in the world what the world has not known before—a structure of peace that can last, not merely for our time, but for generations to come.

We are embarking here today on an era that presents challenges as great as those any nation, or any generation, has ever faced.

We shall answer to God, to history, and to our conscience for the way in which we use these years.

As I stand in this place, so hallowed by history, I think of others who have stood here before me. I think of the dreams they had for America, and I think of how each recognized that he needed help far beyond himself in order to make those dreams come true.

Today, I ask your prayers that in the years ahead I may have God's help in making decisions that are right for America, and I pray for your help so that together we may be worthy of our challenge.

Let us pledge together to make these next four years the best four years in America's history, so that on its 200th birthday America will be as young and as vital as when it began, and as bright a beacon of hope for all the world.

Let us go forward from here confident in hope, strong in our faith in one another, sustained by our faith in God who created us, and striving always to serve His purpose. [Applause, all rising.]

BENEDICTION

Senator COOK, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, our benediction will be

still to be fulfilled. Help us to succeed in given this day by Cardinal Terence J. Cooke.

Cardinal COOKE. Heavenly Father, loving God of our Fathers, on this Inauguration Day we thank You for all the blessings You have bestowed upon our Nation and our people. We thank You for the vast resources of our land, the lofty hopes and ideals of our citizens, the devotion and dedication of those who bear the responsibility of public service.

Heavenly Father, as we approach the second centenary of our freedom and independence, our gratitude for the past carries with it an earnest prayer for the future. We have yet so much to accomplish! There are even now so many of Your blessings not yet adequately shared,

the great and continuing task of assuring a fuller life, true liberty, real peace, and perfect human dignity for all.

Heavenly Father, our Nation's motto proclaims that we trust in You. Help us to realize the full meaning of this trust. Deepen our awareness that without You, even our best effort is as nothing; without Your help, we simply cannot achieve our hopes and our ideals.

Heavenly Father, bless our President and our Vice President who today dedicate themselves to 4 years of service to all the people of this Nation. Give them standing, patience and courage.

Heavenly Father, our Nation yearns for peace. Help us to achieve true peace at home and abroad and to be an example of so many of our hopes and aspirations

a peace-loving, peace-making people to the nations of the world. We are pledged to be "one Nation under God." Bless every effort of our leaders to make us one and keep all of us, Heavenly Father, under the protection of Your abiding and never-failing love. Amen.

Senator COOK. Fellow Americans, the inauguration of our President is more than a traditional ceremony. It is an opportunity to recommit our Nation to the ideals of liberty and peace upon which it was founded.

With this thought in mind, we will now be favored by Miss Ethel Ennis, who will sing "The Star-Spangled Banner". (Miss Ennis sang the national anthem, audience standing.)

(The inaugural ceremonies were concluded at 12:26 p.m.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REVENUE SHARING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, a recent edition of the Greensburg, Pa., Tribune-Review included an interesting editorial concerning the revenue-sharing program.

The editorial points out that according to figures compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the cities and States of this Nation had a tax surplus—surplus—of \$14.8 billion during the second quarter of 1972. By contrast, the Federal Government ran a deficit of \$28.9 billion in the Federal funds for the fiscal year which ended last June 30.

For the 4-year period ending June 30, the accumulated Federal funds deficit will exceed \$100 billion.

Certain large cities are in bad financial condition, as the editorial notes, but the overall condition of our States and municipalities are nowhere near as bad as is the financial condition of the Federal Government.

So long as the Federal Government runs huge deficits, there really is no revenue to be shared with the States and localities. We can only increase the deficit and share the debt.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Poverty Suit," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, and that this editorial be followed by a table I have prepared showing deficits in Federal funds and interest on the national debt.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review, Dec. 14, 1972]

POVERTY SUIT

During the congressional debate over revenue-sharing earlier this year, proponents claimed that the cities and states were des-

titute and needed a handout from Uncle Sam. Opponents, such as Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Ind.-Va., responded that Washington had no money to share and was itself around \$400 billion in debt.

Now it turns out that the revenue-sharing propaganda about bankruptcy of local and state government was no more than political rhetoric. The U.S. Department of Commerce reports that cities and states ran up a \$14.8 billion tax surplus during the second quarter of 1972. Even so cities and states are presently receiving \$2.85 billion in revenue-sharing. During the next five years, federal revenue-sharing will total almost \$30 billion. Congress hasn't bothered to figure out how to pay for the grants so it is possible that the \$30 billion will be added on to the national debt.

Just three states alone, California, New York and Florida, are expected to end up with at least \$1 billion in surplus during fiscal year 1973 which goes through next June 30. Florida has already collected \$300 million over expenditures this year.

Free market economists would rejoice if the federal government could collect a few billion dollars more than it spent in an entire year, let alone a single quarter. They would, in fact, happily settle simply for a balance in taxes and expenditures. Sadly, however, Washington might go another \$30 billion in the hole this fiscal year, for a \$100 billion deficit in just the last three years.

State-local affluence has been reflected in the sale of tax-exempt government bonds. Interest on high-grade 20-year bonds has dropped from 5.5 to less than 5 per cent this year because of increased market demands. Falling interest rates are a sign of rising financial prosperity for the sellers.

Naturally enough, not all cities are in good financial shape. Some of the larger Eastern municipalities are debt-ridden or bankrupt. New York City is probably the most notorious example. Mayor John Lindsay has increased the city's spending from \$3 billion a year to \$8 billion and he still can't balance the budget. Like many other liberal mayors, Lindsay has turned his city into a paradise for loafers, encouraging people to move into New York, stop working and get on the relief rolls which have at least doubled under this administration.

Granted that there are a few poverty pockets around the country, the revenue-sharers were still wrong about a local-state financial crisis. On the contrary, however, Uncle Sam doesn't have just a few poverty pockets he

wears an entire suit of destitution. He is, in fact, the poorest cousin of them all.

DEFICITS IN FEDERAL FUNDS AND INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT, 1954-73 INCLUSIVE

[Billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	Debt interest
1954	62.8	65.9	-3.1	6.4
1955	58.1	62.3	-4.2	6.4
1956	65.4	63.8	+1.6	6.8
1957	68.8	67.1	+1.7	7.2
1958	66.6	69.7	-3.1	7.6
1959	65.8	77.0	-11.2	7.6
1960	75.7	74.9	+.8	9.2
1961	75.2	79.3	-4.1	9.0
1962	79.7	86.6	-6.9	9.1
1963	83.6	90.1	-6.5	9.9
1964	87.2	95.8	-8.6	10.7
1965	90.9	94.8	-3.9	11.4
1966	101.4	106.5	-5.1	12.0
1967	111.8	126.8	-15.0	13.4
1968	114.7	143.1	-28.4	14.6
1969	143.3	148.8	-5.5	16.6
1970	143.2	156.3	-13.1	19.3
1971	133.7	163.7	-30.0	20.8
1972	148.8	177.7	-28.9	21.2
1973 ¹	155.6	188.0	-32.4	22.3
20-year total	1,932.3	2,138.2	-205.9	241.5

¹ Estimated figures.

Source: Office of Management and Budget and Treasury Department.

TED F. MERRILL: MAN OF GOLDEN DEEDS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, history should not be mute to those among us who have given freely of themselves in order to encourage others toward achieving a worthwhile purpose in their lives.

Shakespeare said of Othello, "He hath a daily beauty in his life." Such a description can well apply to Ted F. Merrill who, on January 25, will be justly